

### **IN THE DRAWINGS**

In Section 2 of the present office action, Figures 3d-f et al. are objected to for various conflicts with Section 608.02 of the MPEP. Attached are "Replacement Sheets" for all of the figures. No new matter is added.

## REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated December 22, 2004, having a shortened statutory period set to expire March 22, 2005. Claim 1 has been amended, Claims 7-13 have been cancelled, and Claims 14-18 have been added. Claims 1-6 and 14-18 are now pending.

Applicants appreciate the teleconference held with Examiner Sharp and Supervisor Swann on February 28, 2005. No formal agreement was reached, although an indication was given by the Examiner that the tendered amendments would likely place the pending claims outside the scope of the cited prior art, particularly as claimed in new Claim 14.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In paragraph 8 of the present Office Action, Claims 1-4, 6 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mita et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,206,606 – “*Mita*”) in view of *Gordon* (U.S. Patent No. 6,474,921 - “*Gordon*”), *Coules* (U.S. Patent No. 4,007,516 – “*Coules*”) and *Tomkinson* (U.S. Patent No. RE 16,062). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mita* in view of *Gordon* and *Coules*, and even further in view of *Kelly et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,394,724 – “*Kelly*”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding Exemplary Claim 1, the claimed feature of “an anti-rotation protrusion, wherein the anti-rotation protrusion is mate-able into a keyed opening in a first planar mount to prevent rotation of the sleeve” is supported in the specification as element 306, shown in Figure 3d. The office action cites this feature as taught by claws 10 in *Mita* ‘606, and/or lugs 23 in *Tomkinson* ‘062. Claws 10 in *Mita* ‘606 provide temporary pressure against the bottom of a panel P, as described in *Mita* at col. 4, line 4, and shown in Figure 7. There is no anti-rotation feature provided. Lugs 23 in *Tomkinson* ‘062 are wedged directly into a brick, and are not mated into “a keyed opening.”

Per the teleconference held on February 28, 2005, Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of “the anti-rotation protrusion” being mated to be distinguishable from the cited prior art, and particularly from “Tomkinson.”

New Claim 14 includes the features of original Claim 5. Claim 14 claims the feature of the sleeve and the locking cam being different colors. *Kelly* is cited for this feature in the rejection of Claim 5. However, as stated at col. 1, lines 42-43 of *Kelly*, screws and ferrules are “color matched” as the same color, in order to match screws to ferrules. The present invention uses different colors to provide “a visual cue to a user of the sleeve remaining fixed while the locking cam unit is rotated.”

New Claims 15, 16, 17 and 18 respectively incorporate the features of Original Claims 2, 3, 4 and 6.

### CONCLUSION

As the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all of the presently claimed limitations, Applicants now respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Applicants appreciate the time and courtesy afforded by the Examiner, and respectfully request a telephone call to the undersigned representative if the Examiner feels that such a call would be helpful in promoting the allowance of any of the pending claims.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 50-0563**.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Boice  
*Registration No. 44,545*  
DILLON & YUDELL LLP  
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway  
Suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)